

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-4 and 6-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keene in view of Dutton. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the “Response to Arguments” in the final action. Applicant notes that the office action states that the claimed audio graphics processing circuit is element 201 in Keene and that the local bus is alleged to be the bus between the CPU interface 210 and the system bus. Applicant has amended the claims to indicate that the claimed local bus is coupled to the graphics processing circuit and the audio processing circuit without an intervening bus. (See for example, Applicant’s figures and description). In contrast, codec audio controller 201, alleged to correspond to the claimed audio processing circuit, is coupled to the host interface 210 through multiple intervening buses including the bus that provides data 203, 204, etc. as well as the bus between the codec interface and audio resource manager 208. Keene suffers from similar problems as other prior art systems by employing dedicated multiple intervening buses and structure between the audio processing circuit and the host CPU bus. Keene does not disclose a local bus that is coupled to both the graphics processing circuit and audio processing circuit, coupled without an intervening bus, as claimed. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant also respectfully notes that the memory controller/arbitrator 211 is also alleged to correspond to the claimed bus arbiter. However, Applicant respectfully notes that the claim requires that the claimed bus arbiter interprets “the incoming data” and that the arbiter arbitrates “outputting data on the local bus”. The claim requires that the incoming data is incoming data

from the system bus. In contrast, the memory controller/arbiter in Keene obtains its information from the video graphics controller 209 and audio resource manager 208 and not from the host CPU bus. In addition, the memory controller arbiter 211 is not coupled to a local bus without an intervening bus as claimed nor does it arbitrate the outputting of data in the local bus, instead it arbitrates to/from a memory via a memory bus. Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 are in condition for allowance for at least this reason as well.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that the multimedia adapter 202 does not appear to provide audio processing as claimed since the claim requires that the processing unit audio processes “the associated [audio] data command” when the at least one address identifies audio processing. The audio resource manager in Keene does not appear to execute audio data commands based on address identifiers. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Keene reference does not teach what is alleged and does not teach the claimed subject matter.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 17, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, this claim is also in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2009

By: \_\_\_\_/Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005